

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 6, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 8, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 6-38, and 40-62 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 15, 19, 20, 58, and 59 have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 1-4, 6-19, 22-38, and 40-58 are rejected and claims 20, 21, and 59-62 are indicated to be objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 27 are amended to correspond to objected claims 20 and 59. Claims 21 and 60-62 are amended to be rewritten in independent form. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, 22-38, and 40-57 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,432,826 (*Emami, et al.*), as claiming the same invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1 and 27 are amended as stated above. *Emami* does not teach a reducing agent. Therefore, *Emami*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a reducing agent, as recited in claims 1 and 27, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 15-19, 22-38, 40-45, and 49-58 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,436,302 (*Li, et al.*), as claiming the same invention. Claims 1 and 27 are amended as stated above. *Li* does not teach a reducing agent. Therefore, *Li*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a reducing agent, as recited in claim 1 and 27, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Applicant further traverses the rejection of dependent claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-18, 22-26, 28-38, 40-57 on grounds that they depend on allowable subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,


Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)